

### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

This case has been carefully reviewed and analyzed, and reconsideration and favorable action is respectfully requested.

#### **CLAIM REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. 102(b)**

Claims 1-4, 6-8 and 10 were originally rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Franninge (US-4,954,179).

#### **CLAIM REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. 103(a)**

Claim 5 was originally rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Franninge in view of Mathis et al. (US-5,383,239).

In addition, claim 9 was originally rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Franninge as discussed above.

However, the Examiner has pointed out that claim 11 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Responsive to this, claims 10 and 11 are deleted, and claim 1 is amended which is substantially the combination of original claims 1, 10 and 11 so as to make the claimed invention more distinguishably patentable over the prior art references cited by the Examiner.

Accordingly, by the amendments, it is believed that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) and 103(a) should be withdrawn, and the amended claim 1 should be allowable.

It is further submitted that the amended claims 2-9 should be allowable as they are dependent upon the amended claim 1 which is believed to be allowable.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant submits that the application is now in a condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Ching-Yao Liang  
Applicant

Ching-Yao Liang

58, MA YUAN WEST ST.,

TAICHUNG, TAIWAN

Aug. 12, 2004